IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

THOMAS H. KRAKAUER,)	
on behalf of a class of persons,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	1:14-CV-333
)	
DISH NETWORK, L.L.C.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This class action concluded with a jury verdict on January 19, 2017. The verdict is attached as Exhibit 1. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54 and 23, the Court now enters final judgment on behalf of the class, and it is **ORDERED** and

FINAL JUDGMENT

ADJUDGED that:

- 1. Exhibit 2, filed under seal, describes the 18,066 class members to whom the Rule 23(c)(2) notice was directed, who have not requested exclusion, and whom the Court finds to be class members. It also lists the number of violative phone calls to each class member.
- 2. Consistent with the jury's verdict and the Court's Order awarding treble damages, each member of the class shall recover from the Defendant, DISH Network, LLC, the amount of \$1,200 per call made in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, for an aggregate award in favor of the class of \$61,342,800.00.

- 3. The class is entitled to post-judgment interest on the jury's award at the rate of 1.52% per annum.
- 4. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(h)(1) and 54(d)(2), any motion for attorneys' fees, expenses, and nontaxable costs must be filed no later than 30 days after entry of this Judgment.
- 5. Any motion for taxable costs shall be filed on the schedule set by Local Rule 54.1.
- 6. The Court will enter disbursement orders at appropriate times during and at the conclusion of the claims process established by Order of the Court entered this day.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

This 5th day of April, 2018.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Exhibit 1 Verdict Sheet 14cv333

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

PM 1 2 3 4 5 6 3
JAN 19 2017 Clerk U.S. District Court Greenshord NC
BY S S S S S NAME OF STREET

THOMAS H. KRAK	AUER,)
	Plaintiff,))
v.) 1:14-CV-333
DISH NETWORK L	.L.C.,)
	Defendant.)
	VERI	DICT SHEET
1. Was SSN acting May 11, 2010, through	_	when it made the telephone calls at issue from
[YES		
[] NO		
If Yes, co verdict s	·	2. If No, skip all other questions and sign the
residential num	ber in any 12-mont	receive at least two telephone solicitations to a th period by or on behalf of Dish, when their the National Do Not Call Registry?
[/ YES as t	o Dr. Krakauer and	d all class members
If Yes, co	ontinue to Question	3 and skip the following questions.
		d all class members except the following, whose roven were residential:
	elephone numbers inknown"	that LexisNexis always identifies as
	elephone numbers lay 11, 2010 or afte	that LexisNexis identifies as residential before er August 1, 2011

	[]	Telephone numbers that LexisNexis identifies as "unknown" in the May 2010 to August 2011 time period that the calls were made but identifies differently at other times
	[]	Telephone numbers that LexisNexis identifies as both residential and "unknown"
	[]	Telephone numbers that LexisNexis always identifies as residential, including in the May 2010 to August 2011 time period that the calls were made
	[]	Telephone numbers that LexisNexis identifies as cellular and possibly cellular
[]	NO		
			answer Yes in whole or in part, also answer Question 3. If you r No to Question 2, skip Question 3 and sign the verdict sheet.
What a TCPA \$_		uni	t, up to \$500, do you award for each call made in violation of the
1 Lot	n		Nachen 01/19/2017
Forepe	ersoi	1	Date

3.

Exhibit 2

List of 18,066 Class Phone Numbers (REDACTED) 14cv333